

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 24-29, 38 and 46 were rejected under 35 USC 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 18-25 of US Patent No. 6,799,637. Claims 1-23, 30-37, 39-43 and 47-49 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims 1-25 of US Patent No. 6,799,637. Claims 1-5, 32-35 and 39 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by the Fierens et al. reference, US Publication No. 2002/0035394. Claims 36, 41, 43, 44 and 47-49 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by the Gano reference, US Patent No. 6,478,091. Claims 36, 41 and 43-45 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by the Bixenman et al. reference, US Publication No. 2002/0092649.

Each of the rejections listed above is not applicable and should be withdrawn, because the claims examined were from a parent case rather than the present patent application. A Preliminary Amendment was filed with the present application and contained claims 36, 41 and 43-73, which are the proper subject of examination.

On May 11, 2005, a telephone conference was conducted between Examiner Neuder and the undersigned attorney, Robert A. Van Someren, during which Examiner Neuder explained that the subject Preliminary Amendment was currently in his system but had not been at the time he examined the application. Accordingly, Examiner Neuder suggested that a response be filed to explain what had occurred. During the telephone conference, Examiner Neuder also questioned the apparent correction to the numbering of the original claims. Specifically, the original claim numbering had skipped from claim number 26 to claim number 29. After reviewing the Preliminary Amendment, however, the amendments made to the original claims in an effort to cure this problem are believed to be correct.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner provide another non-final Office Action addressing claims 36, 41 and 43-73 of the Preliminary Amendment as filed with the present application.

The pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. If, however, the Examiner believes certain amendments are necessary to clarify the present claims or if the Examiner wishes to resolve other issues by way of a telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert A. Van Someren
Reg. No. 36,038

Date: May 12, 2005

PO Box 2107
Cypress, TX 77410-2107
Voice: (281) 373-4369